

REMARKS

The Official Action of September 8, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-8, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

New claims 5-8 have been added. Claims 1-8 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishinaga in view of Song. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection especially as applied to independent claim 1 as amended and new dependent claims 5-8.

The devices of Ishinaga and Song are both directed to the type of conventional lamp-type LED packages described in paragraph [0003] of the application, wherein a recess in a preformed base defines or maintains a reflecting surface, i.e. element 5 in Ishinaga and elements 152, 170 in Song. In both of these LED packages a transparent encapsulant (50 in Ishinaga and 154 in Song) is thereafter filled into the recess in the preformed base (which is not transparent) to

encapsulate the exposed sides of only their dies and conductive wires. The exposed sides of their reflecting rings are clearly not encapsulated as their encapsulant only engages the reflecting surfaces of their rings.

In comparison, the claimed invention not only encapsulates the exposed sides of the claimed reflecting ring but also covers the top surfaces of the first and second terminals and their sides down to the bottom surfaces of the terminals. Clearly, neither Ishinaga nor Song teach this structure or the function it serves.

In addition, new dependent claims 5-8 set out structure that further defines over both Ishinaga and Song. Thus, the exposed ends of their terminals are not flush with a side of the encapsulant, their encapsulant does not have a rectangular base or a dome protrusion extending up therefrom or top surfaces of their terminals entirely covered by the encapsulant.

All of these structural differences function to uniquely stabilize the claimed LED package while eliminating the base elements of Ishinaga and Song, thereby simplifying the manufacturing of the package.

Appln. No. 10/808,313

Amdt. dated February 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2004

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\bn\d\dire\hsu117A\pto\Amendment-A.doc